# Exhibit 10

#### Case 4: **22a:snec1:02:00:01/-A5758.9DGB/D-1DT6:cuDnoenin8e1b0:2675|**#Ed 1F21/1928/121/04F/2age 12:2nd/e 12-2nd/e 12-2nd/

| 15 | 11 Defendants. : NO.: 0877  12  13 Thursday, October 13, 2022 14 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  15 Period D. Cook, ESQUIRE, Willox Savage Wells Fargo Center 440 Monticello Avenue, Suite 2200 Norfolk, Virginia 23510 757-628-5661 ecook@wilsav.com | 1 IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF PHILADELPHIA COUNTY FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA  2 SUBJECT OF PENNSYLVANIA  3 JAMES KRAMER, ESQUIRE, DONALD P. BLYDENBURGH, ESQUIRE, OLIVIA KELLY, ESQUIRE, OLIV |
|----|---|--|
|----|---|--|

INDEX

DR CR RD

RC

```
1
 1
          APPEARANCES: (Cont'd.)
 2
                                                                                                                                           2
                   ROBERT E. THACKSTON, ESQUIRE,
Lathrop GPM
2101 Cedar Springs Road
Suite 1400
Dallas, TX 75201
469-983-6023
robert.thackston@lathropgpm.com
 3
                                                                                                                                           3
                                                                                                                                                         PLAINTIFF'S EVIDENCE
 4
                                                                                                                                           4
 5
                                                                                                                                           5
                                                                                                                                                    Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D. -- 5 88
Holly Fisher 106 -- --
 6
                                                                                                                                           6
                                                                                                                                           7
 7
                   ROY F. VIOLA, JR., ESQUIRE,
Gordon & Rees
18 Columbia Turnpike
Suite 220
Florham Park, NJ 07936
973-822-1110
rviola@grsm.com
 8
                                                                                                                                           8
 9
                                                                                                                                           9
10
                                                                                                                                          10
11
                                                                                                                                          11
                    Counsel for Defendant, American International
Industries, successor-in-interest for the
Clubman Brand, and to The Neslemur Company
and Pinaud Company
12
                                                                                                                                          12
13
                                                                                                                                          13
14
                                                                                                                                          14
15
                                                                                                                                          15
16
                                                                                                                                          16
17
                                                                                                                                          17
18
                                                                                                                                          18
19
                                                                                                                                          19
20
                                                                                                                                          20
21
                                                                                                                                          21
22
                                                                                                                                          22
23
                                                                                                                                          23
24
                                                                                                                                          24
```

| BY MR. THACKSTON:  Q. And, in fact, the only denial was that the defendant that she made the claim against denied that they were liable, right?  A. I haven't memorized the entire file that you're speaking about. I know that there was a dispute whether there was exposure. And I'm not quite sure at how far it proceeded or if it was quite sure at how far it proceeded or if it was withdrawn at a certain point.  Q. Well, no matter how it ended up, it started ut with someone saying under oath that they were ut with someone saying under oath that they were signature by the husband, right?  A. I'm sure you have been shown the claim before with the signature by the husband, right?  A. I'm sure you have shown it to me in the past. I don't - but it's been years. And the husband is not the individual. And the individual would have known the exposure more than a husband.  MR. KRAMER: Objection. What are we talking about?  MR. KRAMER: Objection. What are we talking about. And THE COURT: Overruled. Counsel, you know exactly what we are talking about. And you objecting is not going to stop it. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?  A. I was an expert in the Bell case, but I was not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm.  Q. No matter how it turned out, it started out, the plaintiff saying under oath that hew as  Dr. Jacqueline Molline, M.D Cross  Dr. Jacqueline Molline, M.D Cross  Dr. Jacqueline Molline, M.D Cross  1 There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or 1 Individuals. That is standard medical practice. That is standard research practice. I am not doing  |    | Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross                   |    | Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross                   |
|--|----|--|----|--|
| defendant that she made the claim against denied that they were liable, right?  A. I haven't memorized the entire file that you're speaking about. I know that there was a dispute whether there was exposure. And I'm not quite sure at how far it proceeded or if it was dispute whether there was exposure. And I'm not quite sure at how far it proceeded or if it was withdrawn at a certain point.  Q. Well, no matter how it ended up, it started to ut with someone saying under oath that they were exposed to asbestos other than cosmetic talc, right?  MR. KRAMER: Objection. What are we talking about?  THE COURT: Overruled. Counsel, you repeat the question?  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?  No. No. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?  Q. No matter how it turned out, it started out, the WiTNESS: I'm sorry. Can you the Workers' Compensation claim started out with the plaintiff saying under oath that she was exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  1 There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or  1 individuals. That is standard medical practice.  | 1  | BY MR. THACKSTON:                                  | 1  | talc, right?                                       |
| that they were liable, right?  A. I haven't memorized the entire file that 5 you're speaking about. I know that there was a 6 recollection of the rules and regulations since 7 dispute whether there was exposure. And I'm not 8 quite sure at how far it proceeded or if it was 8 Q. You have been shown the claim before with the 9 withdrawn at a certain point. 9 signature by the husband, right? 10 Q. Well, no matter how it ended up, it started 11 out with someone saying under oath that they were 12 exposed to asbestos other than cosmetic talc, 13 right? 14 MR. KRAMER: Objection. What are we 15 talking about? 16 THE COURT: Overruled. Counsel, you 16 know exactly what we are talking about. And 17 know exactly what we are talking about. And 18 you objecting is not going to stop it. 19 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you 19 A. I was an expert in the Bell case, but I was 11 not retained by that firm. I don't recall that I was — I was 12 not retained — I don't recall that I was — I was 13 not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm. 14 Q. No matter how it turned out, it started out with 15 the Workers' Compensation claim started out with 16 the Plaintiff saying under oath that she was 17 the Plaintiff saying under oath that she was 18 exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic 19 Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross 10 Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross 11 There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or 11 individuals. That is standard medical practice.   | 2  | Q. And, in fact, the only denial was that the      | 2  | A. I don't know what how the process starts in     |
| that they were liable, right?  A. I haven't memorized the entire file that 5 you're speaking about. I know that there was a 6 recollection of the rules and regulations since 7 dispute whether there was exposure. And I'm not 8 quite sure at how far it proceeded or if it was 8 Q. You have been shown the claim before with the 9 withdrawn at a certain point. 9 signature by the husband, right? 10 Q. Well, no matter how it ended up, it started 11 out with someone saying under oath that they were 12 exposed to asbestos other than cosmetic talc, 13 right? 14 MR. KRAMER: Objection. What are we 15 talking about? 16 THE COURT: Overruled. Counsel, you 16 know exactly what we are talking about. And 17 know exactly what we are talking about. And 18 you objecting is not going to stop it. 19 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you 19 A. I was an expert in the Bell case, but I was 11 not retained by that firm. I don't recall that I was — I was 12 not retained — I don't recall that I was — I was 13 not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm. 14 Q. No matter how it turned out, it started out with 15 the Workers' Compensation claim started out with 16 the Plaintiff saying under oath that she was 17 the Plaintiff saying under oath that she was 18 exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic 19 Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross 10 Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross 11 There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or 11 individuals. That is standard medical practice.   | 3  | •  |    | •  |
| A. I haven't memorized the entire file that you're speaking about. I know that there was a follow whether there was exposure. And I'm not quite sure at how far it proceeded or if it was ginature by the husband, right?  Q. Well, no matter how it ended up, it started out with someone saying under oath that they were talking about?  MR. KRAMER: Objection. What are we talking about?  MR. KRAMER: Objection. What are we talking about?  MR. KRAMER: Objection. What are we talking about?  THE COURT: Overruled. Counsel, you how exposure more than a husband. The Wallace law firm in Salisbury, North Carolina?  MR. KROW exactly what we are talking about. And you objecting is not going to stop it.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?  MR. THACKSTON: 21 No matter how it turned out, it started out, the Workers' Compensation claim started out, the Paintiff saying under oath that nosmetic exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  A. There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or 1 individuals. That is standard medical practice.   | 4  | •  | 4  | •  |
| dispute whether there was exposure. And I'm not quite sure at how far it proceeded or if it was 8 Q. You have been shown the claim before with the signature by the husband, right? 9 signature by the husband, right? 10 Q. Well, no matter how it ended up, it started 11 A. I'm sure you have shown it to me in the past. 11 out with someone saying under oath that they were 11 Idon't but it's been years. And the husband is not the individual. And the individual would have known the exposure more than a husband. 14 MR. KRAMER: Objection. What are we 15 Wallace law firm in Salisbury, North Carolina? 15 Wallace law firm in Salisbury, North Carolina? 16 THE COURT: Overruled. Counsel, you 16 A. No. 17 Know exactly what we are talking about. And 17 Q. Weren't you a retained expert in the Bell you objecting is not going to stop it. 18 case? 19 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you 19 A. I was an expert in the Bell case, but I was not retained I don't recall that I was I was not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm. 20 Q. No matter how it turned out, it started out, 21 the Workers' Compensation claim started out with 22 on these litigation cases, and you testified about the plaintiff saying under oath that she was 24 these articles on direct examination, and you said there's no epidemiology well, let me back up.  | 5  | A. I haven't memorized the entire file that        | 5  | was the individual. I do not have a specific       |
| quite sure at how far it proceeded or if it was withdrawn at a certain point.  Q. Well, no matter how it ended up, it started 10 A. I'm sure you have shown it to me in the past. I don't - but it's been years. And the husband is exposed to asbestos other than cosmetic talc, 12 not the individual. And the individual would have right? 13 known the exposure more than a husband.  MR. KRAMER: Objection. What are we talking about? 15 Wallace law firm in Salisbury, North Carolina? 16 A. No. 17 Q. Weren't you a retained expert in the Bell case, but I was not retained by that firm. I don't recall that I was I was not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm. 19 Q. No matter how it turned out, it started out, the plaintiff saying under oath that she was 10 Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross 10 Individuals. That is standard medical practice. 11 Individuals. That is standard medical practice. 11 Individuals. That is standard medical practice.   | 6  | you're speaking about. I know that there was a     | 6  | recollection of the rules and regulations since    |
| 9 signature by the husband, right?  10 Q. Well, no matter how it ended up, it started 11 out with someone saying under oath that they were 11 out with someone saying under oath that they were 12 exposed to asbestos other than cosmetic talc, 13 right? 14 MR. KRAMER: Objection. What are we 15 talking about? 16 THE COURT: Overruled. Counsel, you 17 know exactly what we are talking about. And 18 you objecting is not going to stop it. 19 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you 19 A. I was an expert in the Bell case, but I was not retained — I don't recall that I was — I was not retained — I don't recall that I was — I was not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm. 20 No matter how it turned out, it started out, 21 the Workers' Compensation claim started out with 22 the plaintiff saying under oath that she was 23 the Workers' Compensation claim started out with 24 the plaintiff saying under oath that she was 25 exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic 26 Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross 27 There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or 28 Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross 39 Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross 40  10 There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or 11 individuals. That is standard medical practice.   | 7  | dispute whether there was exposure. And I'm not    | 7  | they're state by state.                            |
| 10 Q. Well, no matter how it ended up, it started 11 out with someone saying under oath that they were 12 exposed to asbestos other than cosmetic talc, 13 right? 14 MR. KRAMER: Objection. What are we 15 talking about? 16 THE COURT: Overruled. Counsel, you 17 know exactly what we are talking about. And 18 you objecting is not going to stop it. 19 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you 20 repeat the question? 21 BY MR. THACKSTON: 22 O. No matter how it turned out, it started out, 23 the Workers' Compensation claim started out with 24 the plaintiff saying under oath that she was 25 exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic  10 A. I'm sure you have shown it to me in the past. 11 I don't but it's been years. And the husband is not the individual. And the individual would have host it's been years. And the husband is not the individual. And the individual would have host it's been years. And the husband is not the individual. And the individual would have host it's been years. And the husband is not the individual. And the individual would have host it's been years. And the husband is not the individual. And the individual would have host it's been years. And the husband is not the individual would have host in the visit individual would have host in the visit individual would have host in the very one very one and substance and you expert in the Bell case, but I was not retained I don't recall that I wasI was not retainedI don't recall that I wasI was not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm.  Q. No matter how it turned out, it started out,  16 A. No.  17 Q. Okay. So after you wrote this article based on these litigation cases, and you testified about these articles on direct examination, and you said there's no epidemiology well, let me back up.  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  1 Individuals. That is standard medical practice.  | 8  | quite sure at how far it proceeded or if it was    | 8  | Q. You have been shown the claim before with the   |
| 11 out with someone saying under oath that they were 22 exposed to asbestos other than cosmetic talc, 23 right? 24 MR. KRAMER: Objection. What are we 25 talking about? 26 THE COURT: Overruled. Counsel, you 27 know exactly what we are talking about. And 28 you objecting is not going to stop it. 29 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you 20 repeat the question? 21 BY MR. THACKSTON: 22 Q. No matter how it turned out, it started out, 23 the Workers' Compensation claim started out with 26 exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic 29 Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross 20 Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross 20 Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross 21 There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or 21 Ind the individual. And the individual would have not the husband is not the workers. And the individual would have his husband. 22 A. Have you ever done any work for the Graham and talking about. 31 There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or 32 Inot the individual. And the individual would have his husband. 33 known the exposure more than a husband. 34 known the exposure more than a husband. 35 Wallace law firm in Salisbury, North Carolina? 36 Wallace law firm in Salisbury, North Carolina? 38 C. Waren't you a retained expert in the Bell case, but I was not retained expert in the Bell case, but I was not retained — I don't recall that I was — I was not retained — I don't recall that I was — I was not retained — I don't recall that I was — I was not retained — I don't recall that I was — I was not retained — I don't recall that I was — I was not retained — I don't recall that I was — I was not retained — I don't recall that I was — I was not retained — I don't recall that I was — I was not retained — I don't recall that I was — I was not retained — I don't recall that I was — I was not retained — I don't recall that I was — I was not retained — I don't recall that I was — I was not retained — I don't recall that I was | 9  | withdrawn at a certain point.                      | 9  | signature by the husband, right?                   |
| right? 13 known the exposure more than a husband.  14 MR. KRAMER: Objection. What are we 14 Q. Have you ever done any work for the Graham and 15 talking about? 15 Walace law firm in Salisbury, North Carolina? 16 THE COURT: Overruled. Counsel, you 16 A. No. 17 know exactly what we are talking about. And 17 Q. Weren't you a retained expert in the Bell 200 you objecting is not going to stop it. 18 case? 19 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you 19 A. I was an expert in the Bell 200 case, but I was 19 not retained I don't recall that I was I was 19 not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm. Q. No matter how it turned out, it started out, 10 not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm. Q. No matter how it turned out, it started out with 10 not have the plaintiff saying under oath that she was 10 not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm. 10 not have the plaintiff saying under oath that she was 10 not retained by the firm on epidemiology well, let me back up.  10 Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross 10 Individuals. That is standard medical practice.   | 10 | Q. Well, no matter how it ended up, it started     | 10 | A. I'm sure you have shown it to me in the past.   |
| 13 known the exposure more than a husband.  14 MR. KRAMER: Objection. What are we 14 Q. Have you ever done any work for the Graham and 15 talking about? 15 Wallace law firm in Salisbury, North Carolina?  16 THE COURT: Overruled. Counsel, you 16 A. No. 17 Q. Weren't you a retained expert in the Bell you objecting is not going to stop it. 18 case?  19 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you 19 A. I was an expert in the Bell case, but I was repeat the question? 20 not retained I don't recall that I was I was not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm. 20 Q. No matter how it turned out, it started out, 19 A. I was an expert in the Bell case, but I was not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm. 20 not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm. 21 the Workers' Compensation claim started out with 23 on these litigation cases, and you testified about 24 the plaintiff saying under oath that she was 24 these articles on direct examination, and you said 25 exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic 25 there's no epidemiology well, let me back up.  1 There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or 1 individuals. That is standard medical practice.   | 11 | out with someone saying under oath that they were  | 11 | I don't but it's been years. And the husband is    |
| 14 MR. KRAMER: Objection. What are we 15 talking about? 16 THE COURT: Overruled. Counsel, you 17 know exactly what we are talking about. And 18 you objecting is not going to stop it. 19 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you 20 repeat the question? 21 BY MR. THACKSTON: 22 Q. No matter how it turned out, it started out, 23 the Workers' Compensation claim started out with 24 the plaintiff saying under oath that she was 25 exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  1 There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or  1 Individuals. That is standard medical practice.   | 12 | exposed to asbestos other than cosmetic talc,      | 12 | not the individual. And the individual would have  |
| talking about?  THE COURT: Overruled. Counsel, you  Know exactly what we are talking about. And  you objecting is not going to stop it.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you  Page 1   | 13 | right?   | 13 | known the exposure more than a husband.            |
| THE COURT: Overruled. Counsel, you  16   | 14 | MR. KRAMER: Objection. What are we                 | 14 | Q. Have you ever done any work for the Graham and  |
| know exactly what we are talking about. And you objecting is not going to stop it.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?  No matter how it turned out, it started out with the plaintiff saying under oath that she was exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  know exactly what we are talking about. And 17 Q. Weren't you a retained expert in the Bell case?  A. I was an expert in the Bell case, but I was not retained I don't recall that I was I was not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm. 22 Q. Okay. So after you wrote this article based on these litigation cases, and you testified about the plaintiff saying under oath that she was exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  1 Individuals. That is standard medical practice.  | 15 | talking about?                                     | 15 | Wallace law firm in Salisbury, North Carolina?     |
| 18 you objecting is not going to stop it. 19 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you 20 repeat the question? 21 BY MR. THACKSTON: 22 Q. No matter how it turned out, it started out, 23 the Workers' Compensation claim started out with 24 the plaintiff saying under oath that she was 25 exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic  28 Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  19 A. I was an expert in the Bell case, but I was 29 not retained I don't recall that I was I was 20 not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm. 21 Okay. So after you wrote this article based 22 on these litigation cases, and you testified about 23 the searticles on direct examination, and you said 24 these articles on direct examination, and you said 25 there's no epidemiology well, let me back up.  28 Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  10 Individuals. That is standard medical practice.  | 16 | THE COURT: Overruled. Counsel, you                 | 16 | A. No.   |
| THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you  repeat the question?  20 not retained I don't recall that I was I was  11 BY MR. THACKSTON:  21 not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm.  22 Q. Okay. So after you wrote this article based  23 the Workers' Compensation claim started out with  24 the plaintiff saying under oath that she was  25 exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic  26 Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  1 There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or  1 individuals. That is standard medical practice.  | 17 | know exactly what we are talking about. And        | 17 | Q. Weren't you a retained expert in the Bell       |
| repeat the question?  BY MR. THACKSTON:  Q. No matter how it turned out, it started out,  the Workers' Compensation claim started out with  the plaintiff saying under oath that she was  exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  not retained I don't recall that I was I was  20 not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm.  22 Q. Okay. So after you wrote this article based  on these litigation cases, and you testified about  these articles on direct examination, and you said  there's no epidemiology well, let me back up.  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  1 individuals. That is standard medical practice.   | 18 | you objecting is not going to stop it.             | 18 | case?  |
| BY MR. THACKSTON:  Q. No matter how it turned out, it started out, the Workers' Compensation claim started out with the plaintiff saying under oath that she was exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  1 There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or  1 individuals. That is standard medical practice.   | 19 | THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you                    | 19 | A. I was an expert in the Bell case, but I was     |
| 22 Q. Okay. So after you wrote this article based 23 the Workers' Compensation claim started out with 24 the plaintiff saying under oath that she was 25 exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  1 There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or  1 individuals. That is standard medical practice.   | 20 | repeat the question?                               | 20 | not retained I don't recall that I was I was       |
| the Workers' Compensation claim started out with the plaintiff saying under oath that she was exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or  1 individuals. That is standard medical practice.  | 21 | BY MR. THACKSTON:                                  | 21 | not retained by that firm. I don't know that firm. |
| the plaintiff saying under oath that she was 24 these articles on direct examination, and you said 25 exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic 25 there's no epidemiology well, let me back up.  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross 39  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross 40  There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or 1 individuals. That is standard medical practice.  | 22 | Q. No matter how it turned out, it started out,    | 22 | Q. Okay. So after you wrote this article based     |
| 25 exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic  25 there's no epidemiology well, let me back up.  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  1 individuals. That is standard medical practice.   | 23 | the Workers' Compensation claim started out with   | 23 | on these litigation cases, and you testified about |
| Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or  individuals. That is standard medical practice.  | 24 | the plaintiff saying under oath that she was       | 24 | these articles on direct examination, and you said |
| Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  1 There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or  1 individuals. That is standard medical practice.  | 25 | exposed to asbestos on the job other than cosmetic | 25 | there's no epidemiology well, let me back up.      |
| Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  1 There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or  1 individuals. That is standard medical practice.  |    |  |    |  |
|  |    | Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross                   |    | Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross 40                |
|  | 1  | There's no epidemiology suggesting that barbers or | 1  | individuals. That is standard medical practice.    |
|  | 2  |  | 2  | •  |

24

25

| _  |  |
|----|--|
| 3  | mesothelioma, right?   |
| 4  | A. No such study has yet been conducted. It                      |
| 5  | doesn't mean that it isn't true. But there has not               |
| 6  | been a specific study that I have seen that is                   |
| 7  | specifically looking at barbers and hairdressers.                |
| 8  | Q. Well, we'll get to that. Okay.                                |
| 9  | And so you said that my study is significant                     |
| 10 | because I got these 33 people who were only exposed              |
| 11 | to cosmetic talc and they got meso, right?                       |
| 12 | A. I said my study was significant because it was                |
| 13 | pointing to cosmetic talc as a cause of                          |
| 14 | mesothelioma and alerting physicians that they                   |
| 15 | should take a history. If you read the conclusion,               |
| 16 | that's the point of this article.                                |
| 17 | <ul> <li>Q. After you testified about your article to</li> </ul> |
| 18 | juries, if somebody who's cross-examining you wants              |
| 19 | to make sure that that's right, that in those 33                 |
| 20 | cases there was no other exposure alleged                        |
| 21 | exposure to asbestos, you take the position that                 |
| 22 | you won't disclose the names of any of those cases,              |
| 23 | right?   |
| 24 | A. I take that position regardless of what                       |
|    |  |

situation I'm in. I do not disclose the names of

25

| - 1 | individuals. That is standard medical practice.    |
|-----|--|
| 2   | That is standard research practice. I am not doing |
| 3   | anything different from any colleague that I know  |
| 4   | at any institution.                                |
| 5   | MR. THACKSTON: Object to                           |
| 6   | responsiveness about what colleagues do.           |
| 7   | THE COURT: Overruled.                              |
| 8   | BY MR. THACKSTON:                                  |
| 9   | Q. Well, let's take that a step at a time. So      |
| 10  | you're not they're treating physician. You have no |
| 11  | physician-patient relationship with any of the 33, |
| 12  | right?   |
| 13  | MR. KRAMER: Objection, Judge. This                 |
| 14  | is now going into questioning regarding            |
| 15  | whether or not or how she may the reason           |
| 16  | why she's not going to be revealing these          |
| 17  | individuals. And when we had this                  |
| 18  | conversation, counsel said he was not              |
| 19  | THE COURT: I agree, he did say                     |
| 20  | that.  |
| 21  | MR. THACKSTON: I'm sorry, Your                     |
| 22  | Honor?   |
| 23  | THE COURT: You did say that you                    |

were limited to the issue that you have

already touched. Sustained.

| 1  | BY MR. THACKSTON:                                 | 1  | individuals in my paper.                            |
|----|---|----|---|
| 2  | Q. The position well, Northwell, your             | 2  | Q. And you testified earlier about Workers'         |
| 3  | employer, is the one that has the information,    | 3  | Compensation orders. Have you read you're aware     |
| 4  | right?  | 4  | that there's a 40-page order from a federal court   |
| 5  | MR. KRAMER: Same objection, Judge.                | 5  | saying that your position that you can't talk about |
| 6  | THE COURT: What's the purpose of                  | 6  | those people is wrong, right?                       |
| 7  | the question?                                     | 7  | MR. KRAMER: Objection, Judge.                       |
| 8  | MR. THACKSTON: I'm sorry, Your                    | 8  | THE COURT: Sustained.                               |
| 9  | Honor?  | 9  | BY MR. THACKSTON:                                   |
| 10 | THE COURT: What's the purpose of                  | 10 | Q. Have you read that opinion yet?                  |
| 11 | this question, Counsel?                           | 11 | MR. KRAMER: Objection.                              |
| 12 | MR. THACKSTON: I'm so sorry?                      | 12 | THE COURT: Sustained.                               |
| 13 | THE COURT: What is the purpose of                 | 13 | BY MR. THACKSTON:                                   |
| 14 | this question?                                    | 14 | Q. All right. In the denial                         |
| 15 | MR. THACKSTON: Oh. The purpose of                 | 15 | MR. THACKSTON: May I approach, Your                 |
| 16 | the question is that the information has          | 16 | Honor? May I display the denial that she's          |
| 17 | already been released by Northwell.               | 17 | talking about?                                      |
| 18 | THE COURT: Okay. Well, why don't                  | 18 | MR. KRAMER: We object, Your Honor.                  |
| 19 | you ask that.                                     | 19 | THE COURT: Denials of?                              |
| 20 | BY MR. THACKSTON:                                 | 20 | MR. THACKSTON: The last question.                   |
| 21 | Q. Northwell has already produced the records     | 21 | THE COURT: Can you come over here?                  |
| 22 | that shows that Mrs. Bell was a member of your    | 22 | I don't know what you're talking about.             |
| 23 | study, right?                                     | 23 | BY MR. THACKSTON:                                   |
| 24 | A. I what my organization might have done, I      | 24 | Q. The only denial in that Workers' Compensation    |
| 25 | will not discuss. I will not discuss names of the | 25 | claim I'm going to represent to you that my         |
|    |   |    |   |

### Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D. - Cross

43

#### Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D. - Cross

44

information is the only denial is the defendant this case? 1 2 2 We're not here talking about Mrs. Bell. We're saying, "We deny the claim." Α. 3 Are you aware of a judicial order finding that 3 here talking about Mrs. Reichart. I would like the Mrs. Bell's Workers' Compensation claim was 4 jury to hear about Ms. Reichart and not about 5 unfounded? 5 another case. 6 THE COURT: Well, since I'm going to 6 MR. KRAMER: Same objection. 7 THE COURT: Overruled. 7 decide what the jury hears, objection 8 THE WITNESS: My understanding was 8 sustained on that question. If you have 9 that there was a dispute and then either the 9 something that you want to approach the 10 case was withdrawn or there was a decision. I 10 witness with, you may approach the witness 11 may be misremembering, but I know it did not 11 go any further than that. That there was a 12 12 The reason why you're being asked 13 dispute that there was any exposure. I 13 about Ms. Bell was because she's part of your thought it went and either a judge made that study. So it's not totally irrelevant. 14 14 15 determination or the case was withdrawn at 15 Next question. 16 that point. And no further action was taken. 16 BY MR. THACKSTON: So that's my recollection. I don't know. 17 17 And I happen to know something about the Bell 18 BY MR. THACKSTON: 18 case because I was involved in it. For the other 19 Would you want that shown to the jury, if 32 cases, you haven't released any identification 19 20 there is such a thing, would you want that shown to 20 information on those 32 cases either? 21 the jury in this case to back you up on that? 21 MR. KRAMER: Objection, Your Honor. 22 Which thing? 22 MR. THACKSTON: It's the last 23 Q. If there is any such thing as an order finding 23 question. that Mrs. Bell's Workers' Compensation claim was MR. KRAMER: I still object to it. 24 24 25 unfounded, would you want to jury to see that in 25 It could be three questions from the end.

## 

| 1  | THE COURT: It's asked and answered.  | 1  | a few of these people. One of the parts of the   |
|--|--|--|--|
| 2  | I mean, she said she   | 2  | paper deals with what you call fiber burden  |
| 3  | MR. THACKSTON: Okay.   | 3  | studies, right?  |
| 4  | THE COURT: Sustained, Counsel.   | 4  | A. There were six cases that had tissue  |
| 5  | MR. THACKSTON: Okay.   | 5  | evaluated.   |
| 6  | BY MR. THACKSTON:  | 6  | Q. It says your article says, "While fiber   |
| 7  | Q. Now, Doctor, one of the things that your  | 7  | burden studies are rarely undertaken in the course   |
| 8  | article your article says that there were was  | 8  | of clinical treatment, and they're used primarily  |
| 9  | it three hairdressers in your study?   | 9  | for medico-legal purposes, the finding of various  |
| 10   | A. Yes.  | 10   | fibers in the lung tissues can provide guidance on   |
| 11   | Q. Okay. And is this your article that I have on   | 11   | potential prior asbestos exposure, et cetera"  |
| 12   | the screen now?  | 12   | Right?   |
| 13   | A. I'm sorry, I didn't hear what you said.   | 13   | A. Yes.  |
| 14   | Q. Is this your article that I have up on the  | 14   | Q. Do you know whether there has been any fiber  |
| 15   | screen?  | 15   | burden analysis done of Mrs. Reichart's tissue?  |
| 16   | A. Yes.  | 16   | A. I haven't seen any.   |
| 17   | Q. And one of the things you say that's  | 17   | Q. Now, you reference in your papers something   |
| 18   | highlighted over here on the right is that, "The   | 18   | called a mesothelioma registry?  |
| 19   | high prevalence of unexplained or idiopathic   | 19   | A. Can you point me to what you're talking about?  |
| 20   | mesothelioma among women necessitates further  | 20   | <ul> <li>Q. Do you remember mentioning the Italian</li> </ul>  |
| 21   | inquiry into the potential non-occupational  | 21   | mesothelioma registry?   |
| 22   | exposures such as exposure to asbestos contaminated  | 22   | A. Yes.  |
| 23   | talcum powder." Right?   | 23   | Q. And you say that you say, quote, "Typically   |
| 24   | A. Yes.  | 24   | patients with mesothelioma will be simply asked  |
| 25   | Q. So you note the you note the occupations of   | 25   | whether they worked with or around asbestos, rather  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross   |  | Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross   |
| 1  | Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross   | 1  | Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross   |
| 1 2  | Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross than being provided with a listing of potential   | 1 2  | Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  A. Correct.  |
| 2  | Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might  | 2  | <ul><li>Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross</li><li>A. Correct.</li><li>Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained</li></ul>   |
| 2  | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among  | 2<br>3   | Dr. Jacqueline Moline, M.D Cross  A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right?   |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also   | 2<br>3<br>4  | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them.  |
| 2  | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right?   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational exposures to asbestos in their mesothelioma. In  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a fan in it?  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational exposures to asbestos in their mesothelioma. In our paper, there were three female hairdressers who  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a fan in it? A. I'm not going to comment on the mechanics of a  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational exposures to asbestos in their mesothelioma. In our paper, there were three female hairdressers who regularly used talcum powder in their work."   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a fan in it? A. I'm not going to comment on the mechanics of a hairdryer.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational exposures to asbestos in their mesothelioma. In our paper, there were three female hairdressers who regularly used talcum powder in their work."   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a fan in it? A. I'm not going to comment on the mechanics of a hairdryer. Q. And so in your article you're saying there's   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational exposures to asbestos in their mesothelioma. In our paper, there were three female hairdressers who regularly used talcum powder in their work."  Right?  A. Correct.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a fan in it? A. I'm not going to comment on the mechanics of a hairdryer. Q. And so in your article you're saying there's no other possible exposure to asbestos. But then  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational exposures to asbestos in their mesothelioma. In our paper, there were three female hairdressers who regularly used talcum powder in their work."  Right?  A. Correct.  Q. But then you say, "It was unclear from any of  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a fan in it? A. I'm not going to comment on the mechanics of a hairdryer. Q. And so in your article you're saying there's no other possible exposure to asbestos. But then you mention hairdressers. And then you cite an   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational exposures to asbestos in their mesothelioma. In our paper, there were three female hairdressers who regularly used talcum powder in their work."  Right?  A. Correct.  Q. But then you say, "It was unclear from any of the histories noted in the medical records that  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a fan in it? A. I'm not going to comment on the mechanics of a hairdryer. Q. And so in your article you're saying there's no other possible exposure to asbestos. But then you mention hairdressers. And then you cite an article that says, a source of asbestos exposure to   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational exposures to asbestos in their mesothelioma. In our paper, there were three female hairdressers who regularly used talcum powder in their work."  Right?  A. Correct.  Q. But then you say, "It was unclear from any of the histories noted in the medical records that these women were asked if they used talcum powder  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a fan in it? A. I'm not going to comment on the mechanics of a hairdryer. Q. And so in your article you're saying there's no other possible exposure to asbestos. But then you mention hairdressers. And then you cite an article that says, a source of asbestos exposure to hairdressers could be hairdryers. Right?  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational exposures to asbestos in their mesothelioma. In our paper, there were three female hairdressers who regularly used talcum powder in their work."  Right?  A. Correct.  Q. But then you say, "It was unclear from any of the histories noted in the medical records that these women were asked if they used talcum powder as part of the haircutting process." And you say,  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a fan in it? A. I'm not going to comment on the mechanics of a hairdryer. Q. And so in your article you're saying there's no other possible exposure to asbestos. But then you mention hairdressers. And then you cite an article that says, a source of asbestos exposure to hairdressers could be hairdryers. Right?  THE COURT: Can you put that back  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational exposures to asbestos in their mesothelioma. In our paper, there were three female hairdressers who regularly used talcum powder in their work."  Right?  A. Correct.  Q. But then you say, "It was unclear from any of the histories noted in the medical records that these women were asked if they used talcum powder as part of the haircutting process." And you say, "In a report from the national mesothelioma  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a fan in it? A. I'm not going to comment on the mechanics of a hairdryer. Q. And so in your article you're saying there's no other possible exposure to asbestos. But then you mention hairdressers. And then you cite an article that says, a source of asbestos exposure to hairdressers could be hairdryers. Right?  THE COURT: Can you put that back up, please? There's no objection, but you  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational exposures to asbestos in their mesothelioma. In our paper, there were three female hairdressers who regularly used talcum powder in their work."  Right?  A. Correct.  Q. But then you say, "It was unclear from any of the histories noted in the medical records that these women were asked if they used talcum powder as part of the haircutting process." And you say, "In a report from the national mesothelioma registry of Italy" now, that's like a listing of   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a fan in it? A. I'm not going to comment on the mechanics of a hairdryer. Q. And so in your article you're saying there's no other possible exposure to asbestos. But then you mention hairdressers. And then you cite an article that says, a source of asbestos exposure to hairdressers could be hairdryers. Right?  THE COURT: Can you put that back up, please? There's no objection, but you didn't read the complete sentence in there.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational exposures to asbestos in their mesothelioma. In our paper, there were three female hairdressers who regularly used talcum powder in their work."  Right?  A. Correct.  Q. But then you say, "It was unclear from any of the histories noted in the medical records that these women were asked if they used talcum powder as part of the haircutting process." And you say, "In a report from the national mesothelioma  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a fan in it? A. I'm not going to comment on the mechanics of a hairdryer. Q. And so in your article you're saying there's no other possible exposure to asbestos. But then you mention hairdressers. And then you cite an article that says, a source of asbestos exposure to hairdressers could be hairdryers. Right?  THE COURT: Can you put that back up, please? There's no objection, but you didn't read the complete sentence in there.  MR. THACKSTON: Only examine   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational exposures to asbestos in their mesothelioma. In our paper, there were three female hairdressers who regularly used talcum powder in their work."  Right?  A. Correct.  Q. But then you say, "It was unclear from any of the histories noted in the medical records that these women were asked if they used talcum powder as part of the haircutting process." And you say, "In a report from the national mesothelioma registry of Italy" now, that's like a listing of all the mesothelioma cases in Italy, right?   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a fan in it? A. I'm not going to comment on the mechanics of a hairdryer. Q. And so in your article you're saying there's no other possible exposure to asbestos. But then you mention hairdressers. And then you cite an article that says, a source of asbestos exposure to hairdressers could be hairdryers. Right?  THE COURT: Can you put that back up, please? There's no objection, but you didn't read the complete sentence in there.  MR. THACKSTON: Only examine hairdryer use as a potential exposure. No   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational exposures to asbestos in their mesothelioma. In our paper, there were three female hairdressers who regularly used talcum powder in their work."  Right?  A. Correct.  Q. But then you say, "It was unclear from any of the histories noted in the medical records that these women were asked if they used talcum powder as part of the haircutting process." And you say, "In a report from the national mesothelioma registry of Italy" now, that's like a listing of all the mesothelioma cases in Italy, right?  A. Yes.  Q. "Staff noted a cluster of mesothelioma due to  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a fan in it? A. I'm not going to comment on the mechanics of a hairdryer. Q. And so in your article you're saying there's no other possible exposure to asbestos. But then you mention hairdressers. And then you cite an article that says, a source of asbestos exposure to hairdressers could be hairdryers. Right?  THE COURT: Can you put that back up, please? There's no objection, but you didn't read the complete sentence in there.  MR. THACKSTON: Only examine hairdryer use as a potential exposure. No discussion of the occupational use of talcum  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational exposures to asbestos in their mesothelioma. In our paper, there were three female hairdressers who regularly used talcum powder in their work."  Right?  A. Correct.  Q. But then you say, "It was unclear from any of the histories noted in the medical records that these women were asked if they used talcum powder as part of the haircutting process." And you say, "In a report from the national mesothelioma registry of Italy" now, that's like a listing of all the mesothelioma cases in Italy, right?  A. Yes.  Q. "Staff noted a cluster of mesothelioma due to unknown exposure among a hairdressers, but they  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a fan in it? A. I'm not going to comment on the mechanics of a hairdryer. Q. And so in your article you're saying there's no other possible exposure to asbestos. But then you mention hairdressers. And then you cite an article that says, a source of asbestos exposure to hairdressers could be hairdryers. Right?  THE COURT: Can you put that back up, please? There's no objection, but you didn't read the complete sentence in there.  MR. THACKSTON: Only examine hairdryer use as a potential exposure. No discussion of the occupational use of talcum powder. Footnote 51.                                     |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational exposures to asbestos in their mesothelioma. In our paper, there were three female hairdressers who regularly used talcum powder in their work."  Right?  A. Correct.  Q. But then you say, "It was unclear from any of the histories noted in the medical records that these women were asked if they used talcum powder as part of the haircutting process." And you say, "In a report from the national mesothelioma registry of Italy" now, that's like a listing of all the mesothelioma cases in Italy, right?  A. Yes.  Q. "Staff noted a cluster of mesothelioma due to  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a fan in it? A. I'm not going to comment on the mechanics of a hairdryer. Q. And so in your article you're saying there's no other possible exposure to asbestos. But then you mention hairdressers. And then you cite an article that says, a source of asbestos exposure to hairdressers could be hairdryers. Right?  THE COURT: Can you put that back up, please? There's no objection, but you didn't read the complete sentence in there.  MR. THACKSTON: Only examine hairdryer use as a potential exposure. No discussion of the occupational use of talcum powder. Footnote 51.  THE COURT: If you're going to read |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | than being provided with a listing of potential sources of the types of exposure in which one might encounter asbestos. Cases of mesothelioma among hairdressers characterized as idiopathic, also underscore the contribution of an incomplete exposure history. The potential failure to identify use of talcum powder exposure in their work would prevent the linking of occupational exposures to asbestos in their mesothelioma. In our paper, there were three female hairdressers who regularly used talcum powder in their work."  Right?  A. Correct.  Q. But then you say, "It was unclear from any of the histories noted in the medical records that these women were asked if they used talcum powder as part of the haircutting process." And you say, "In a report from the national mesothelioma registry of Italy" now, that's like a listing of all the mesothelioma cases in Italy, right?  A. Yes.  Q. "Staff noted a cluster of mesothelioma due to unknown exposure among a hairdressers, but they examined hairdryer use as a potential exposure." | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | A. Correct. Q. Because hairdryers at one time contained asbestos, right? A. Some of them might have, not all of them. Q. And they have a fan in them that blows air through them, right? A. I'm not a hairdryer expert. Q. You're not aware of whether a hairdryer has a fan in it? A. I'm not going to comment on the mechanics of a hairdryer. Q. And so in your article you're saying there's no other possible exposure to asbestos. But then you mention hairdressers. And then you cite an article that says, a source of asbestos exposure to hairdressers could be hairdryers. Right?  THE COURT: Can you put that back up, please? There's no objection, but you didn't read the complete sentence in there.  MR. THACKSTON: Only examine hairdryer use as a potential exposure. No discussion of the occupational use of talcum powder. Footnote 51.                                     |